Appl. No.: 10/626,317 Amdt. Dated: 6/15/05

Reply to Office Action of: 03/22/2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-32 remained in this application. Claims 1, 9 and 28 have been amended. New claim 33 has been added.

1. Claim Rejections under 35 USC §112

Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

In particular, the Examiner indicates that it is unclear whether the compounds $1.1 \text{SrO}-1.5 \text{Al}_2 \text{O}_3-13.6 \text{SiO}_2-\text{TiO}_2$ and $11.2 \text{SrO}-10.9 \text{Al}_2 \text{O}_3-24.1 \text{SiO}_2-\text{TiO}_2$ are expressed in terms of moles or weight percent. Applicant's assert that this characterization is not unclear. It is conventional to express ceramic compositions in terms of moles of each oxide component. Thus, these components expressed in this way, with a number 1.1, 1.5, 13.6, etc., are understood to be in moles. This is readily apparent to a person of ordinary skill in the art. Further, titania, although it lacks a numerical indicator, is also understood to mean 1.0 mole of TiO₂, as is also conventional practice in the art.

Regarding claim 9, it has been amended to correct the dependency to claim 7. Accordingly, claim 9 now further limits claim 7.

Regarding claims 16 and 32, Examiner has pointed out a clear error in claim 1. In claim 1, the values of x, y, z and b can be zero, as described in the preferred embodiment. Accordingly, the expression in claim 1, namely " $0.5 < u \le 0.95$, $0.01 < v \le 0.5$, $0.01 < w \le 0.5$, $0 < x \le 0.5$, $0 < y \le 0.1$, $0 < z \le 0.5$, $0 < a \le 0.3$, and $0 < b \le 0.3$ " should read as follows: $0.5 < u \le 0.95$, $0.01 < v \le 0.5$, $0.01 < w \le 0.5$, 0.01 < w

2. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-32 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph.

Examiner is thanked for the indication of allowable subject matter.

Concerning Examiner's reasons for allowance, although Applicants agree that Ogunwumi US 6,620,751 is the closest prior art, Applicants believe the reasons for allowance, although also correct, misses the point of distinction of the invention. In particular, Ogunwumi US 6,620,751 does not fairly teach or suggest the combination of u (Al₂O₃-TiO₂), v (SrO-Al₂O₃-2SiO₂ or 11.2SrO-10.9Al₂O₃-24.1SiO₂-TiO₂) and w (3Al₂O₃-2SiO₂) in the amounts of 0.5 < u \leq 0.95, 0.01 < v \leq 0.5, 0.01 < w \leq 0.5, as claimed.

3. New Claim

A new claim 33 is submitted herewith that rephrases the composition described in claim 1 in simple terms. Claim 33 is directed to a ceramic article having a composition, comprising: Al₂O₃-TiO₂, and (SrO-Al₂O₃-2SiO₂ or 11.2SrO-10.9Al₂O₃-24.1SiO₂-TiO₂)

Appl. No.: 10/626,317 Amdt. Dated: 6/15/05

Reply to Office Action of: 03/22/2005

and 3Al₂O₃-2SiO₂. Such a combination is neither taught or suggested in the prior art. Accordingly, claim 33 is also believed allowable.

4. Conclusion

Based upon the above amendments, remarks, and papers of records, Applicants believe the pending claims of the above-captioned application are in allowable form and patentable over the prior art of record. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Applicants believe that no extension of time is necessary to make this Reply timely. Should Applicants be in error, Applicants respectfully request that the Office grant such time extension pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) as necessary to make this Reply timely, and hereby authorizes the Office to charge any necessary fee or surcharge with respect to said time extension to the deposit account of the undersigned firm of attorneys, Deposit Account 03-3325.

Please direct any questions or comments to Randall S. Wayland at 607-974-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6-15-05

Randall S. Wayland Attorney for Assignee Reg. No. 36,303 Corning Incorporated

SP-TI-03-1 Corning, NY 14831